

G. L. Arš, *I. Kapodistrija i grečeskoe nacional'no-osvoboditel'noe dvizhenie 1809-1822 gg.* (=Ioannis Kapodistrias and the Greek national liberation movement 1809-1822), Moscow, ed. Nauka, 1976, pp. 328.

It is no matter of chance that A. I. Gercen compared the Greeks of Pericles and the Greeks of Byzantium with the Greeks of Kapodistrias (p. 5), it is a fact, however, that no Soviet historian had previously produced a monograph on Ioannis Kapodistrias and his activities in the field of national liberation (p. 7). This gap has now been filled by G. L. Arš's monograph.

The author traces the Corfiot count's career from his arrival in the Russian Empire in 1809 until his departure in 1822. Of course, before 1809 Kapodistrias was neither unknown nor insignificant and had distinguished himself politically in the Ionian Republic between 1803-1806. The period from 1809-1822 was a significant one in Modern Greek history because this was when the preparations for the Revolution were being made and completed. Kapodistrias had nothing to do with the revolutionary activities of the *Filiki Etaireia* but played a leading part in the founding of the *Literary Society* (Φιλολογικός Σύλλογος) in Bucharest (1810) and the *Arts Club* (Φιλόμουσος Ἐταιρεία) in Vienna (1815), both of which were working for the liberation of his country, but in a different way from the *Filiki Etaireia*. He founded schools in Greece and took a leading interest in the country's cultural development. Naturally, he took great care to stay out of secret revolutionary organisations: in 1820 he wrote to K. Vardalahos asking him to refute any rumours to the contrary. However, when the *Filiki Etaireia*'s preparations for the uprising were transformed into a nationwide Revolution for liberation from the Ottoman yoke, Kapodistrias did not conceal the fact that, all unwitting, he himself had been a spur urging the Greeks on to the events of 1821; "...Bez vsjakogo s moej storony želanija sklonit' Grekov k sverženiju iga, ja tem ne menee sam togo ne želaja i ne znaja, pobudil ih k nastojaščim ih geštivijam...", as he wrote to the countess R. Edling in November 1821 (p. 250). Kapodistrias's stay in the Russian Empire made a significant contribution to Greek-Russian relations and particularly to the increase of Philhellenism in the Tsars' Empire. Also, Kapodistrias was a scholar who strongly shared the cultural values of the Russian Empire at that time (pp. 41-47); for example, he had been a member of the Academy of Science in St. Petersburg since 1818 (p. 41). But the Corfiot diplomat's great service lay not so much in his experience regarding the organisation of Bessarabia and Poland in his capacity as adviser to Alexander I, but in the fact that in Russia he was Metternich's opposite (p. 31); a liberal and enlightened scholar, his patriotism led him to take great pains to direct the Tsar's interest towards Greek problems. When he finally realised that the Russians had no desire to help the Greeks ("...Ne hotjat dejstvovat' v nastojaščij moment..."), as he wrote to A. S. Sturdza in August 1821, he resigned from his post with great bitterness (p. 239).

The author has made use of records in the libraries and archives of the Soviet Union, material which is almost, if not absolutely, inaccessible to non-Soviets. His contribution is of great value because he has thus been able to reveal certain facts about Kapodistria's life which were hitherto unknown, or at least little known (pp. 251-310). It is significant that the author mentions the fact that Kapodistrias—who considered England's constitutional monarchy to be the ideal system of government (p. 37) and who was also an adherent of Montesquieu and particularly admired his work *L'Esprit des Lois*—succeeded in influencing even Tsar Alexander I with his "liberal-monarchist" (liberal'no-monarhičeskie) views at the time of the Congress of Vienna (p. 39).

My only criticism regards p. 249 where the Greek moderates, Kapodistrias among them, are said to have been in favour of Greece's liberation, but as they feared the revolutionary activities of the masses (...no bojac' revoljucionnyh gejtstvij narodnyh mass...), they sought national independence by other means. It is my belief, until the contrary is proved, that the moderate stand of Kapodistrias and the other Greek moderates did not stem from fear of the Greek people. However, G. L. Arš's work certainly fills a gap in the literature regarding Kapodistria's stay in Russia. S. Laskaris (*Kapodistrias avant la révolution grecque*, Lausanne 1918) and C. W. Crawley ("John Capodistrias and the Greeks before 1821", *Cambridge Historical Journal*, vol. XIII, no. 2, 1957) both wrote about Kapodistria's time in Russia, but neither of them had access to the Soviet Archives as G. L. Arš did.

The book is a smart and well-presented publication by the Nauka publishing house.

*Institute for Balkan Studies*

CONSTANTINE PAPOULIDIS

A. M. Stanislavskaja, *Rossija i Grecija v konce XVIII-načale XIX veka. Politika Rossii v Ioničeskoj Respublike 1798-1807gg.* (=Russia and Greece during the late XVIIIth and early XIXth centuries. Russia's policy in the Ionian Republic between 1798-1807), Moscow, ed. Nauka, 1976, pp. 376.

The diverse changes in their historical fate made the Ionian Islands a centre of diplomatic and military activity for many countries. If every occupying power (Venice, France, Turkey, Russia, England) today needs to explain its presence there and to justify its position, then Soviet scholars have a two-fold task: the first is the same as that of the scholars of the other countries; but the second applies specifically to the Soviet scholars who deal with Russia's foreign policy—because they have to look at their pre-revolutionary historical writings from a new angle.

This aim has been fulfilled by A. M. Stanislavskaja's work, which examines the situation in the Ionian Islands during the Venetian Occupation, the social and political extensions of the anti-feudalistic movement in the late XVIIIth and early XIXth centuries, the birth of the United Ionian Islands' Republic between 1798-1800, the anti-feudalistic movements and the role of the Great Powers between 1800-1802, Russia's policy in the Ionian Islands and the 1803 Constitution, the nature of Russia's 'protection' between 1804-1806, Russia's policy and its repercussions in North-Western Greece between 1800-1806 and finally Russia's relations with the Ionian Republic at the beginning of the Russo-Turkish war of 1806-1807. In particular Ms Stanislavskaja examines Russia's foreign policy in the Ionian Islands during the period 1798-1807—that is from the fall of the French monarchy to the Treaty of Tilsit. The central point of this study is a sociological examination of the role of the Russian administration, and of Admiral F. F. Ušakov in particular, and of the Russian state in the elaboration of the Constitutions of 1799, 1803 and 1806. The author intends to deal more extensively with Admiral F. F. Ušakov in a future monograph. Concerning the 1803 Constitution, the author notes characteristically that at that time in Russia it was easier for someone to devise the outline of a constitution for the distant Ionian Republic than to bring about certain facilitations for the Russians themselves within the Russian Empire (p. 365).

Ms Stanislavskaja has produced a composite work concerning Russia's foreign policy with particular reference to her presence and policy in the Mediterranean at a time when the